

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 24-8280-MWC(Ex)

Date May 7, 2025

Title ELECTRIC SOLIDUS, INC., ETC. v. PROTON MANAGEMENT LTD., ET AL.

Present: The Honorable Charles F. Eick, United States Magistrate Judge

Valencia Munroe
Deputy Clerk

None
Court Reporter/Recorder

None
Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:
None

Attorneys Present for Defendants:
None

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS)

The Magistrate Judge has read and considered all papers filed in support of and in opposition to Plaintiff’s “Motion to Compel Defendants to Comply with Targeted Discovery” (“the Motion”), filed April 23, 2025, except the papers filed May 5, 2025 (“Statement Regarding Swan’s Motion to Compel, etc.” and “Defendant Proton’s Further Supplemental Memorandum, etc.”), both of which are hereby stricken as violative of Local Rule 37-2.3. The previously noticed May 16, 2025 hearing is vacated. The Magistrate Judge has taken the Motion under submission without oral argument.

The Motion seeks further responses to Plaintiff’s Requests for Production Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 and Plaintiff’s Interrogatories Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. The District Judge previously stated that Plaintiff’s “targeted requests are narrowly aimed at discovery relevant to [Plaintiff’s] requests for a preliminary injunction, that is, whether the Individual Defendants are using [Plaintiff’s] trade secrets outside of 2040 Energy.” (Doc. 164, p. 13).

The parties dispute the adequacy of Plaintiff’s trade secret identification. However, Defendants represent that Defendants’ responses to the subject discovery have been, and will be, unaffected by this dispute. Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge need not and does not address this dispute in ruling on the present Motion.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.	CV 24-8280-MWC(Ex)	Date	May 7, 2025
Title	ELECTRIC SOLIDUS, INC., ETC. v. PROTON MANAGEMENT LTD., ET AL.		

It is ordered that Defendants shall serve complete responses without objection to: (a) Plaintiff's Requests for Production Nos. 1, 2, 3 (with "offered" understood to include oral offers as well as written offers) and 4; and (b) Plaintiff's Interrogatories Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 (with "offered" understood to include oral offers as well as written offers) and 5. In responding to the interrogatories, Defendants may elect the Rule 33(d) option, if appropriate, provided that Defendants specify in sufficient detail the records that must be reviewed and give Plaintiff a reasonable opportunity to examine and make copies of the records specified.

This ruling is without prejudice to the right of Defendants (including the Individual Defendants) to seek a stay of discovery from the District Judge (under Coinbase, Inc. v. Bielski, 599 U.S. 736 (2023) or otherwise). Absent a stay obtained from the District Judge (or an extension of time obtained from the District Judge), Defendants must comply with this Order by serving the further responses and producing the responsive documents no later than thirty-five (35) days from the date of this Order.

cc: Judge Court
All Counsel of Record

Initials of Deputy Clerk VMUN